

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 8, 2000 LB 1004

of this state. So we are not trying to make it any...anything more complicated or try to enhance the law of the other state. We're saying the law of the other state within this twelve year period, if the person violated that law and it was...it is consistent then with what...with what we are doing, and if it would have been a conviction under Nebraska law, it applies for the enhanced penalty. So that part of it, I think, is pretty clear. As far as what Senator Hilgert is referring to, I'm not certain how that would be drafted into this. I think that what we are trying to do is to create a law that says let's go back and determine whether or not the person had been previously convicted of an offense. And I think that the way in which that would be accomplished is probably not by our legislation. I think it would be accomplished by some sort of a national program where there is a record kept of previous violations by people and that that file would be in such a position that someone could evaluate and see if there has been a conviction or has been a conviction under another state. But I don't know how Nebraska would do it in our law and make it effective. So I think that what we are proposing at this point is a law that will allow the offense from a prior conviction to be used to enhance the penalty in Nebraska, and if...we have to use the facilities that are available to us now to determine whether or not a person has been convicted in another state, and I think that those are matters that we are going to have to accomplish in cooperation with a national association because we can't do it on our own. So, thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Don Pederson. Further discussion on the Chambers amendment to LB 1004, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I can agree with every thing that Senator Hilgert said, and I want to make it clear that all that I had agreed to do was to rewrite the language. I didn't change anything. I didn't add any ideas. I didn't take any away. If the bill had merit before I did this rewrite, it would have the merit now. If it had problems in terms of due process, fair treatment, nondiscrimination, if it had those problems prior to the rewrite that I did, it still has those problems now. The only thing that I was agreeing to do was to rewrite it so that we could